



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## The Need for a Concord of Nations

By ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH.D.

Professor of the Science of Government, Harvard University

A FEW months ago I spent five weeks at the splendid bathing beach of Waikiki in the Hawaiian Islands, that wonderous place of the daring swimming board and the bold outrigger canoe. I saw hundreds of people daily coming in on their surf-boards or paddling in a canoe which it was almost impossible to overturn. While I was there the press reported that an English nobleman had arrived in Honolulu. His Countess one day wanted to participate in this great sport of canoe riding. So she chartered an outrigger canoe with its picturesque native crew. They went out about three-quarters of a mile, and as they were turning to mount the wave, they were caught by a breaker and the impossible occurred—the canoe was reversed and her Ladyship was thrown into the water. The crew gallantly gathered to her assistance, and held her up while they called for help. The life saving crew darted out from the shore; they found her Ladyship alive, took her aboard and brought her back, and she was restored to her husband amid expressions of gratitude and tears. Just one thing seemed to escape the attention of the brave rescuers. The reason why they have surf riding on Waikiki Beach is because it is a coral bench and at no place is the water any deeper than four and one-half feet, so that all her Ladyship would have had to do was to set her pink toes on the bottom and walk to shore.

I can not help feeling, with regard to the salvation of the world, that we are in much the same position. Our boat has been overthrown and we are struggling in the waves. Is it possible to reach that far-off shore? Of course it

is, if we recognize the world we are living in. If we simply stand upon the bottom and attempt to make our way on our own feet we shall reach the shore.

I have long been an advocate of the League of Nations with views on it very much like Artemus Ward's views on the Civil War, many years ago. "Yes," he said, "I'm in favor of this war, I was in favor of the last war, and I'm in favor of the next war. In fact I have been in favor of the next war for fifteen years." I am in favor of any league, concert, association or syndicate, sewing circle, if you like to make it, if only it will associate and bring nations together.

Now that is one of the most difficult problems that has ever been faced by the human mind. When I find statesmen disagreeing as to the road, but both roads pointed straight at the same goal, namely, at some sort of a combination of the organized communities of this world in such a form that they may dwell together in peace and harmony, and when each of these statesmen feels sure that the goal can be reached, I feel that the goal surely may be reached if we will set our foot on the bottom; but in order to reach that goal we must recognize the world in which we live.

A little while ago I attended a session of the American Society of International Law in Washington. I have not had such a good time since I went to Sunday School. Everybody agreed with everybody else, because there was no opportunity to disagree. I notice in Sunday School that you are not allowed to find the text. The teacher does that, and the text on this occasion was—we all had to listen to sermons upon it—that the next thing to do is

to simply start afresh and renew international law where it left off, and sail along. It had received a jounce in 1914. That body of internationalists in Washington—I was one of the gang, I admit it—agreed that all that was necessary after seven years interruption was to hitch up again. They seemed to think that it was exactly like an automobile—the thing had stopped and the self-starter would not work. All right, we will just get out and crank it up, and then it will start again exactly as it was in 1914. World saving is not so easy.

#### INEQUALITY OF NATIONS

We must recognize hard and disagreeable facts, the facts of the world, the facts about us. In the first place, we must accept the inequality of nations. That is a hard thing to do but it has to be done, exactly as we have had to accept the practical inequality of citizens. So far as governmental power goes, so far, to a large degree, as political influence goes, the theory that there are sixty-five equal nations is not the truth. The war showed that. It came out finally that in the world there are about eight great powerful nations, which together have more than one-half the population of the globe. In war, what those eight nations said went. They happened to be grouped in opposite gangs, but the great nations that participated, that finally brought the war to a conclusion, one group imposing its will upon the other, will be the great nations for the next fifty years.

There are no new powerful nations in sight, except, perhaps, Australia and Brazil—and possibly some kind of a South American combination. There is no geographical place in the world for additional great powers, with an exception with regard to Asia, of which I shall speak later. It is not true that

all nations are equal or can be equal, in international law, and of all people on earth we Americans are those who most distinctly hold that view of inequality. We recognize that there is a status of colonies and dependencies. We appreciate the iniquities of that system when it is a question of Russian dominions or of Turkish provinces, or French or German or English colonies, but we are the same kind of folks ourselves. There is no use for us to try to dodge that issue. Is not Cuba as much a dependency of the United States as Canada is of Great Britain, to all intents and purposes, with the addition that Cuba is too weak to think of actual independence? Cuba is no more independent than Philadelphia County is independent of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Is Panama independent? Read the newspapers of the spring of 1921 and find out what the independence of a small isthmus state is. Of course, Panama makes its own decisions undisturbed, provided it is the same decision that would otherwise have been made at Washington.

We have five of those dependencies—Panama, Nicaragua, Haiti, San Domingo and Cuba. We have no notion of giving up any one of them. There are people who think that we might give up some of them to advantage, but we do not mean to do it, any more than England means to give up the West Indies or India. We must accept the fact that there are colonies, or we must set our faces against it and begin by divesting ourselves of a control over five groups of people who are perfectly willing to be ruled by us providing we do not ask them to do what they do not want to do.

In the next place, we must admit that there are subnormal nations—that lovely word. We have just reached the point of recognizing normal and subnormal persons. In the same way

we must admit that there actually exist normal and subnormal nations.

No person in the United States, I suppose, has a more intimate knowledge of Latin-America than the President of this American Academy. If I were to ask him the question directly he would say: "Yes, with few exceptions the Latin-American states are not on the same footing of civilization and government as most of the modern nations." They may arrive at that high stage, but their ideas of government and their methods of government are different, and they will remain different for some time to come.

There is no use trying to say that we are on an equality with Paraguay and Venezuela and Ecuador or for the matter of that with Mexico. We know in our own mind that that is not the way we feel. We know we do not treat them as we insist on being treated. If an American goes anywhere—we must follow him and protect him—and that principle is gaining ground. If a Mexican comes over into Texas his neighbors lynch him. Do we protect him? Do we allow Mexico to come over and protect him? No. That is to say, as a matter of fact, all the large powers and most of the small powers in the world recognize the fact that the world is made up of units of different weight. Now, this identical fact was taken up, so to speak, in the League of Nations—I mean to say the present incomplete League which looks like a Tower of Babel in process of simplification.

To me it is absolutely futile for us to try to connect the American government with the other governments under that system. Not because it was a bad system—I did not lose many hours of sleep even over Article X—I thought we could manage that. I thought that if a crisis arose the United States could take care of itself, that it was not likely to be squeezed by Article

X. Nevertheless, many people felt that it would be dangerous. Hence, nothing is going to be accomplished, there is no good to be reached, by the attempt of any body of persons in the United States to persuade the present Administration that the United States ought to accept the League of Nations about as it stands. I should have liked to see it adopted with or without amendments. I could live safely under it and I think my children and grandchildren could. Still, I must say that I see no hope of the League being adopted by a series of amendments, even amendments suggested by the United States government and then adopted abroad.

It is not worth while to go into a discussion of the League. What I want to say is simply that unless we recognize that there is a difficulty there, inherent in the minds of Americans, a part of our political adjustment at the present moment, we shall never advance toward a system of international community.

#### THE PLACE OF ASIA

Again, we must recognize that Asia stands on a different footing from England. Asia the wonder, the miracle of the world; Asia the seat of empires, the starting point of the human race; Asia which has produced the only three world religions—Buddhism, Mohammedanism and Christianity, every one founded by an Asiatic; Asia, land of infinite learning and science and philosophy. A few years ago I stood in the City of Kashing in China—I had never heard its name before—and there was a tablet to show that 3,000 years ago there was a city on that site. Where were our ancestors 3,000 years ago? They were not building cities; they were still struggling toward civilization.

We must accept China as a world condition. We must likewise take

India into international account. I learned when I was in India that there are only about 2,000 civil service Englishmen who are drawing large salaries and getting a good living out of the region. As a matter of fact, England has put more capital into India than she has ever taken out. Nevertheless how on earth can 46,000,000 people, a divided people at home, indefinitely manage a great community of 315,000,000? Anybody who has been out there must recognize that eventually Asia is going to rise up. We must admit it as a basic fact. Asia is bound to demand the admission of the civilized people of China and India into the family of nations.

#### NEW INTERNATIONAL LAW

Another necessity of the time is to recognize the changes in international law; and that is a fundamental. We have an uncertain body of recorded principles of international law—and I was struck in the recent meeting in Washington by the way in which those principles were developed and turned over, and rolled like a sweet morsel under the tongue, leaving the real international law unregarded. For instance, what is the policy of the United States with regard to the freedom of the seas? We know what it has been for a hundred years previous to 1914. We know what it was in the first years of the war, but when we went into the war we absolutely turned our back upon that theory. Anybody can see that if there is to be a war in the future the United States is a nation that will always rely on the biggest war ships, because we shall have them. The United States will attack its enemies where they can be hurt, by attacking their commerce, as was done in this war; no kind of a shackle can you put on the United States or any other great maritime power to compel it to go back to

that doctrine of the freedom of the seas, which has been so dear to us and which we supposed was permanent.

Take the question of humanity in war. It depends upon the ground principle that it is not worth while to kill a non-combatant or destroy an undefended town, because that does not get you anywhere; you are no further along. It is not supposed to be good sport to kill a wounded enemy, because he is out of the fight anyway. But in the last war it was to military advantage to kill wounded enemies. That is why so many wounded were killed—killed by the English, by the French and by Americans—because if you left your wounded enemy he would wait until your back was turned, then he would shoot you, and you knew it.

What does "cleaning up the trenches" mean? We all know what it means. If you are to stop that kind of thing you can not do it by preliminary Red Cross agreements. Those agreements were worth nothing against Germany in 1914 when Europe was confronted by a powerful army and nation that was determined not to be bound by them.

#### NEW INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

That leads to a very brief outline of what, it seems to me, can be done in the way of new international relations. In the first place, you must create a new body of international law—but not by an international legislature. You can not make international law by a body of international delegates. You can not even make all the law of the United States by the two Houses of Congress as they are constituted today. Therefore, the way to bring international concord about is on the same lines on which it has been going for fifty years; namely, by a succession of international conventions upon one subject after another, such as may be made by direct treaty but which can better be made by

general treaties with a large number of subscriptions.

For international harmony we need an administrative body, and that is the great merit of the Covenant of the League of Nations, namely, that the final decisions are made by the great statesmen of the various countries gathered together. Here again we are down on the bed rock of facts. There is not one single community in the United States, not a state, not a city in the Union, that would ever dream of the United States being habitually outvoted by the other twenty American Republics with their population of 80,000,000, against our population of 105,000,000. We never will or can go into any international organization upon the principle of "one community, one vote." We will not accept it. No large power will accept it. No combination of small powers can put it over. Therefore, we must have some kind of organization corresponding to the Council of the present League now operating for European powers in Europe.

In the next place, that body must be able to make decisions within certain limits that have been prescribed for it, because otherwise it is nothing. An international body without authority to say anything is like a melon without a rind—it has no substance upon which you can operate.

Third, there ought to be an international court, principally because so many good people think that it is desirable, not because an international court can ever do what we want most. The thing that the world is crying and calling and screaming for is not a court which decides who is in the wrong after the wrong is committed; we want some influence, some power, that is anterior to the wrong. For that is the only way we can possibly stop war.

In conclusion, we need peace. We

must have peace. How are we going to achieve it unless we have some kind of an international organization that will get to work within the next five years and will include the United States. I care not what you call it—League, Association, any name that means the nations of the world grouped together under the necessary superior power of those who have the superior power. It is not a question of giving eight, ten or twelve powers a decision in such matters. They have that decision now, whenever they choose to organize and assert it. A court which can decide justiciable matters will undoubtedly remove many controversies from diplomacy; only somehow or other it sticks in my mind that justiciable cases are self-defined as cases that could be settled without a court.

Thus we arrive at a conclusion. There is no world association, there is no world court, in the true sense of the name, without some power of "putting it over." No critical decisions can be made by unanimous consent, including the consent of the wrongdoer. Our danger is a danger at noonday, it is the bursting bomb, the flying airship, the submarine suddenly coming. The modern conditions of war are such that the world is no longer protected simply by agreements, nor by any process which means the submission of a dispute to somebody, in the expectation that nobody is to move until that dispute is decided. There is just one thing that will stop war, and that is some kind of moral and physical combination which, in the last resort, can confront, prevent, and, if necessary, crush the powers of evil. If a Gorgon state like Germany arises again, there is only one way to check it, and that is international accord.

For God's sake let us take some steps toward having that accord prepared before the contest.